

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed on April 16, 2009, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 and 16-20 remain in this application, where claims 12-15 have been currently canceled without prejudice and claims 16-17 have been currently added. Applicants reserve the right to reintroduce subject matter deleted herein at a later time during the prosecution of this application or continuing applications. Claim 1 is independent.

By means of the present amendment, the current Abstract has been deleted and substituted with the enclosed New Abstract which better conforms to U.S. practice. Further, the specification has been amended for better conformance to U.S. practice.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 8 and 11 for certain informalities. In response, claims 1 and 8 have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion and to remove the noted informalities. It is respectfully submitted that the

objection to claims 8 and 11 has been overcome and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 2, 7-10 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed. However, to advance prosecution, claims 2, 7-9 have been amended for better clarity and claims 12-15 have been canceled without prejudice. It is respectfully submitted that this rejection of claims 2, 7-10 and 12-15 has been overcome. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. However, in the interest of advancing prosecution, claims 12-15 have been canceled without prejudice. The cancellation of claims 12-15 renders moot this rejection with regard to these claims.

In the Office Action, claims 1-6 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,570,714 (Soane) as evidence by a publication entitled "Structure and Rheology of Molten Polymers - From Structure to Flow Behavior and Back Again (Dealy)". Claims 7, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

or under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Soane. Further, claim 13 is rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) over Soane in view of an article entitled "Influence of Epoxy Hardener on Miscibility of Blends of Poly(methyl methacrylate) and Epoxy Network" (Ritzenthaler). Claim 15 is rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) over Soane in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,842,787 (Kopg-Sill) and U.S. Patent No. 6,585,939 (Dapprich). Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that claims 1-11 and 16-20 are patentable over Soane, Dealy, Ritzenthaler, Kopg-Sill and Dapprich for at least the following reasons.

Soane is directed to a method for making a precision composite article including optical lenses. The lenses are fabricated using a semi-solid molding process.

It is respectfully submitted that Soane does not disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1 which, amongst other patentable elements, recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

curing the molded blend by UV radiation to obtain the polymeric optical microstructure having a thickness to diameter ratio of the polymeric optical microstructure is from 1/50 to 1/1000.


Curing a molded blend to obtain the polymeric optical microstructure having a thickness to diameter ratio of the polymeric optical microstructure is from 1/50 to 1/1000, is nowhere disclosed or suggested in Soane. Dealy, Ritzenthaler, Kogge-Sill and Daprich are cited to allegedly show other features and do not remedy the deficiencies in Soane.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claim 1 be allowed. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-11 and 16-20 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claim 1 as well as their individually patentable elements.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
July 15, 2009

**THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP**  
Applied Technology Center  
111 West Main Street  
Bay Shore, NY 11706  
Tel: (631) 665-5139  
Fax: (631) 665-5101

Please direct all inquiries and correspondence to:  
Michael E. Belk, Reg. 33,357  
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001  
(914) 333-9643